



Smith ScholarWorks

Government: Faculty Publications

Government

3-1-2010

Whatever Happened to Feminist Critiques of Marriage?

Martha A. Ackelsberg
Smith College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.smith.edu/gov_facpubs



Part of the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ackelsberg, Martha A., "Whatever Happened to Feminist Critiques of Marriage?" (2010). Government: Faculty Publications, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
https://scholarworks.smith.edu/gov_facpubs/13

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Government: Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu

Whatever Happened to Feminist Critiques of Marriage?

Recent passage of anti-gay marriage initiatives in California and Maine, combined with the legalization of same-sex marriage in Vermont, New Hampshire and Connecticut (and, previously, in Maine!), present us with renewed opportunities for discussion and debate about the *politics* of gay marriage. Many of those supporting same-sex marriage have argued that gays and lesbians should have a right to marry because, in effect, they are “just like” heterosexual couples, and ought not be denied access to the same rights and benefits as those couples. But feminists have long criticized marriage as an institution; indeed, feminism and gay liberation used to be about *challenging* the centrality of marriage, rather than asking “in.”

This symposium begins from a question: What happens to that critique in the face of current debates? If marriage is a product of patriarchal, class-based, and racist institutions, why argue to extend its reach? Further, at a time when health care, social security, and a variety of social supports are on the public agenda, why argue for marriage as *the* (or even *a*) primary way to access them? On the other hand, how could feminists *not* oppose efforts to deny rights to gays and lesbians? How do we navigate this terrain (both politically and theoretically)?

In the essays that follow, our contributors reflect on the increasingly complicated politics of gay marriage in the United States. The initial inspiration for this Critical Perspectives section was a panel at the 2008 meetings of the American Political Science Association entitled “Why NOT Marry?” (organized by Ann Robbart, and including presentations by Martha Ackelsberg, Jyl Josephson, Angelia Wilson, Katherine Triantafillou, and Nancy Polikoff) that offered a variety of perspectives about alternatives

to marriage, and some *caveats* about treating access to marriage as the preferred solution to the inequities of heterosexual privilege in the contemporary U.S. Our contributors here begin from the awareness that, in the context of the mainstream political debate, there has been relatively little questioning of the struggle for “marriage equality” as an appropriate goal, either for the lesbian/gay/queer rights movement, or for progressive activists more generally.

These essays encourage us to think about arguments for marriage in the context not only of rights to intimate association, but also of debates about the politics of care, understandings of liberal freedoms, the place of religion, and the construction of frameworks for social provision more generally. Jyl Josephson takes issue with the ways supporters of gay marriage effectively reinforce binary oppositions, denying the diversity of actual family construction in the contemporary US, while Lori J. Marso-- drawing on the writings of Simone de Beauvoir-- highlights the ways struggles for gay marriage potentially reinforce exclusive notions of bourgeois respectability. Tamara Metz explores the ways using marriage to address issues of care provision effectively denies the freedom and equality we purport to uphold; and Angelia R. Wilson draws on European examples to call for a rethinking of the relationship between marriage and care provision. Our hope is that these papers will spark further “conversation,” and broaden the frame of the discussion about marriage and equality.

Martha Ackelsberg

Department of Government and Program for the Study of
Women and Gender, Smith College

